pretend to delight in slipshod scholarship. No doubt, if a lecturer could devote all his time to teaching and preparation, his lectures would improve greatly, not only in arrangement and method, but even more in the substance of the information which he tries to convey, but it ought not to be assumed that there is neither method nor substance in current lectures.

Under the present system there is neither time to dwell extensively upon the historical foundations of the law, nor is the lecturer able to devote the thought and research necessary to give his lectures the stamp of originality or profound learning. This is almost necessarily university work and could hardly be done—or appreciated if done—where the students are engaged for most of the time in office practice as well. At the same time it is doubtful whether too much work of that kind is desirable for students who propose to engage in the active practice of our profession for a living.

The purely practical lawyer or law student who knows no law and exults in his ignorance cuts a deplorable figure in a learned profession, but, on the other hand, the lawyer steeped in historical detail, who attaches importance to the form of an indictment or pleading merely because those matters were considered vital by an earlier generation, is a menace. It is he who is largely responsible for appeals on interlocutory matters, for litigation upon some point of only technical significance, and for elaborate arguments upon the form of indictment under which a thief has been convicted. We hear much about the length of debates over technicalities in some of the States of the Union, about the difficulty of securing convictions there, owing to some defect in form and about the number of appeals taken, and one sometimes wonders whether these defects in the administration of the law are not partly due to the fact that the lawyer engaged attended a good Law School in the States without spending much time in an office, devoted all his time to his studies, and heard much about the earlier law upon technical matters delivered by professors who had laboured greatly in unearthing ancient decisions, and who, perhaps, had unwittingly caused the student to attach undue importance to his researches. It may be that, in Ontario (as in England), our law is more expeditious, while quite as satisfactory in its results, because so often information on the subject has been imparted by a lecturer-practitioner to one who is equally a student-practitioner. In this way the practical and theoretical are permitted to work and do work side by side. To those who advocate the